IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

TUESDAY, THE 24TH JULY 2007 / 2ND SRAVANA 1929

WP(C).No. 22676 of 2007(Y)

PETITIONER:

N. VISWAMBHARAN,
BEEN COTTAGE, KATTACHALKUZHI P.O.,BALARAMAPURAM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.T.K.ANANDA PADMANABHAN
SMT.S.LAKSHMY (ATTINGAL)

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE KERALA LOK AYUKTA,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

2. THE SECRETARY,
VADAKODE HANDLOOM WEAVERS CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY LTD
NO.T-348, PUNNAKAD, PERUMPZHUTHOOR P.O.,
NEYYATTINKARA.

3. THE PRESIDENT,
VADAKODE HANDLOOM WEAVERS CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY LTD
NO.T-348, PUNNAKAD, PERUMPZHUTHOOR P.O.,
NEYYATTINKARA.

4. THE INSPECTOR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES,
HANDLOOM OFFICE OF THE CO-OP. INSPECTOR,
NEYYATTINKARA CIRCLE, NEYYATTINKARA.

5. GENERAL MANAGER,
DISTRICT INDUSTRIES CENTRE, VELLAYAMBALAM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

6. THE DIRECTOR OF HANDLOOM & TEXTILES,
VIKAS BHAVAN, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

7. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY CHIEF SECRETARY,
SECRETARIAT, TRIVANDRUM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. BENJAMIN PAUL

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 24/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

S. SIRI JAGAN, J.

W.P.(C)NO.22676 OF 2007

DATED THIS THE 24th DAY OF JULY, 2007

JUDGMENT

The petitioner challenges Ext.P3 order of the Lok Ayukta. The petitioner filed Complaint No.852/2003 before the Lok Ayukta seeking investigation/enquiry into the complaints by an officer attached to the 1st respondent. However, the 1st respondent dismissed the complaint holding that the petitioner has failed to establish the allegations made by him in the complaint against the respondents and therefore he is not entitled to get the relief claimed in the complaint. The petitioner is challenging that order.

2. I have gone through Ext.P3 order. It is a very elaborate order dealing with each and every contention of the petitioner and entering separate finding in respect of each of the petitioner's contention. The Lok Ayukta did not find it necessary to proceed further since Lok Ayukta was not satisfied that the petitioner had made out a case for the relief prayed for. I cannot re-appreciate the evidence and come to a different conclusion exercising my discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, especially since what the petitioner seeks is to re-appreciate the

materials produced by him before the Lok Ayukta and to come to a different conclusion.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

S. SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE

Acd